

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/020,760	10/29/2001	Takaaki Takeda	P/2291-107	8688	
7590 05/31/2006			EXAMINER		
Steven I. Weisburd, Esq.			SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A		
Dickstein Shap	iro Morin & Oshinsky	LLP			
41st Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
1177 Avenue of the Americas			2154		
New York, NY 10036-2714			DATE MAILED: 05/31/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/020,760	TAKEDA, TAKAAKI		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Mohammad A. Siddiqi	2154		

Advisory Action	10/020,760	TAKEDA, TAKAAKI				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Mohammad A. Siddiqi	2154				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe		correspondence add	7055			
• •		•	1633			
THE REPLY FILED 03 May 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. I. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejection E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL						
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	is of the date of e appeal. Since			
AMENDMENTS	be the factor than John of filling a belof					
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co 			ecause			
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo		12 50.017,	,			
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		The state of the s	(
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		Il be entered and an e	explanation of			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	it before or on the date of filing a N	otion of Annual will no	at he entered			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	d sufficient reasons why the affidat	vit or other evidence is	s necessary and			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	ils to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been consideration because:	dered but does NOT place the appli	cation in condition for	allowance			
See Continuation Sheet.		•				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	۷o(s)				
13. Other:						
JOHN FOLLANSBEE SUPERV CORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to Applicant's argument filed on 05/03/2006, Shaio does not teach "extracting first feature information from the inflow block of data at the ingress, wherein the first feature information identifies the inflow block of data", examiner respectfully disagrees, Shaio teaches extracting (col 9, lines 47-53) first feature information from the inflow block of data (col 3, lines 20-27) at the ingress (converting RESV message into control message includes step of extracting, col 6 lines 17-53), wherein the first feature information identifies (Fig 8C of the instant application can only be interpreted as a data packet) the inflow (col 3, lines 20-27) block of data (fig 9, col. 3, lines 20-28; col. 9, lines 47-51, extracts the control messages), sending the first feature information from the ingress to the egress (converting RESV message to control message for egress, col 6, lines 17-53). Shaio also teaches determining whether the first feature information extracted at the ingress matches the second feature information extracted at the egress (steps 222, 240, tag 238, Fig. 13; Fig. 12; col 6, lines 47-53; col 11, lines 35-67; col 12, lines 1-9, finding short cut includes extracting and matching). Sufleta discloses extracting second feature information from the outflow block of data at the egress, wherein the second feature information identifies the outflow block of data (elements of fig 9; col 10, lines 52-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Shaio and Sufleta. The motivation would have been monitoring a Quality-of-Service parameters over the network and constantly matching the signatures supplied by the probes to confirm delivery and obtain packet travel time.